REMARKS

Status of Claims

Prior to entry of this paper, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-11, 14-15, 17-19, 21-24, 27-30, and 33-100 were pending and subject to restriction.

Claims 6-8, 46, and 64-85 are canceled herein. Claim 63 is amended herein. New claim 101 is presented herein. No new matter is introduced.

Upon entry of this paper, claims 1, 3, 5, 10-11, 14-15, 17-19, 21-24, 27-30, and 33-45, 47-63, and 86-101 are pending. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any canceled subject matter in one or more continuing applications.

Support for Amendments

Claim 63 is amended herein to remove various species. Support for claim 63 can be found in the specification as originally filed, for example on page 7, line 21 through page 8, line 7. New claim 101 is added. Support for new claim 101 can be found on page 8, for example, at lines 14-15 and 25. No new matter is introduced.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an in-person interview with Applicants' representatives on January 28, 2009. In the course of the interview, it was agreed that Applicants would cancel the claims directed to the species which were the subject of the Restriction Requirement of November 28, 2008, and upon cancelation of such claims, the Restriction Requirement of November 28, 2008 would be withdrawn. Upon entry of this paper, the claims are canceled. Accordingly, Applicants understand that an election in response to the

Restriction Requirement of November 28, 2008, is not necessary and the Restriction Requirement of November 28, 2008 is withdrawn.

Restriction Requirement of July 25, 2008

Claims 19, 21-24, 27-30, 33-39, and 41, are drawn to methods of using and methods of making haemostatic compositions, corresponding to Groups II and III according to the Restriction Requirement of July 25, 2008. Applicants traversed the Restriction Requirement of July 25, 2008, in the response filed October 17, 2008. Applicants understand that the claims are withdrawn by the Examiner pursuant to the Restriction Requirement of July 25, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 5, 10-11, 14-15, 17-18, 40, 42-45, 47-63, and 86-101, are drawn to haemostatic compositions, corresponding to Group I according to the Restriction Requirement of July 25, 2008.

Remarks Regarding Yannas (US Patent No. 4,280,954)

While the pending claims are not rejected, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants demonstrate below that the pending claims are neither anticipated nor obvious over Yannas (US Patent No. 4,280,954). Specifically, Yannas fails to teach haemostatic compositions comprising gelatin and HA or derivative thereof, where the amount of HA or derivative thereof is at least 10% (w/w), or a haemostatic composition comprising gelatin and HA or a derivative thereof, wherein the HA or derivative thereof is incorporated into the composition by cross-linking with dry heat at 110-200°C, or an HA or derivative thereof having a molecular weight of from 1,500 to 5,000 kDa. In other words, Yannas fails to anticipate or render obvious the pending claims, and therefore the pending claims are patentable over Yannas.

Yannas teaches composite materials of collagen and a mucopolysaccharide which are said to have anti-coagulant properties. In addition, the cross-linked mucopolysaccharides of Yannas serve to improve stability *in vivo* with increased resistance to resorption while maintaining blood compatibility (see Yannas, col. 3, lines 12-13, 21-25, and 31-33). In contrast, the instant compositions comprise gelatin and they are pro-coagulant. Therefore, the present invention is directed to solving a different technical problem than Yannas.

Moreover, Yannas teaches seven different species of mucopolysaccharide and notes differences between HA and the other species with respect to performance. For example, Example 15 of Yannas provides results of a resorption resistance assay. The assay shows that while all other composite materials exhibit reduced collagen degradation, material with collagen cross-linked to HA fails to exhibit this property (see column 25, Table IX and lines 57-65). Furthermore, Examples 12 and 13 of Yannas show that the HA-collagen composites fail to exhibit significant differences in whole blood clotting time (WBCT) compared to collagen itself. These data demonstrate that collagen-HA is comparable to collagen alone in reducing whole blood clotting time under the conditions specified by Yannas, and therefore would not suggest the use of this combination in a pro-clotting combination. Indeed, the data presented by Yannas highlight the surprising discovery that compositions comprising gelatin and HA according to the present invention possess a pro-coagulant effect.

Even more surprising is the synergy shown by the components of the present invention. For instance, Example 6 of the present application show that gelatin sponges with HA reduce bleeding intensity more than gelatin sponges without HA. A gelatin sponge with 30% HA reduces bleeding 5.2 times better than a gelatin sponge without HA (Table on page 32, S4 versus S1). Collagen in combination with 10% HA also reduces bleeding, i.e., 1.43 times better than

collagen alone (see page 32, lines 8-13 of the present application). While not wishing to be bound by theory, the lower amount of incorporated HA may account for some of the effect, which is supported by data in Example 6 of the present application, i.e., gelatin powder with 10% HA reduces bleeding 1.28 times better than gelatin powder alone, while the gelatin sponge with 30% HA reduces bleeding 5.2 times better than the gelatin sponge without HA, as noted above.

On the other hand, the examples of Yannas have a percentage of HA in the composite materials ranging from 2.3% $\pm$ 0.5 to 9.0% $\pm$ 0.5. In contrast, the present application discloses compositions of at least 10% (page 8, lines 9-20), with examples of specific use of HA in amounts of at least 13% (Example 3), 25-50% (Example 1) and 30% (Examples 6 and 7). For at least the reason that Yannas provides examples with a lower amount of HA which yield a different effect, Yannas does not preclude patentability for the instant claims. Moreover, the examples of Yannas have a maximum of 9.5% HA in combination with collagen, so it could not have been predicted from Yannas that the incorporation of 10% or more HA into a gelatin-based composition would have a synergistic effect on haemostasis, as described above.

Furthermore, Yannas fails to teach a composition as instantly claimed, but rather discloses anti-coagulant materials such as films, tape, membranes and composites. Applicants note that when a sponge is claimed, the instant specification provides a definition of a sponge on page 5, lines 13-18, as a porous structure that may absorb liquid. This is in contrast to the grafts or implants taught by Yannas, which are not intended to absorb liquid. Yannas does not disclose sponge structures, as the collagen-HA of Yannas loses weight due to degradation, and the other composites initially de-swell upon implantation.

Finally, Applicants note that Yannas describes HA derived from rooster comb, employing the method of Swann et al. for extraction. Swann et al. states that HA is a

polydisperse product with both high and low molecular weight species, but Swann actually provides a molecular weight of 230 to 1,200 kDa for the different HA fractions (see Swann, page 24, Table III). For comparison, the molecular weight range cited e.g. in claim 45 is from 1,500 to 5,000 kDa. It is also worth noting that Yannas teaches physical cross-linking, but only with temperatures of up to 95°C (see col. 9, lines 2-28). In contrast, e.g. claims 23, 24, 33, 40, 42 and 43 of the present application cite that – surprisingly – it is possible to use cross-linking with dry heat at higher temperatures than Yannas, namely 110-200°C (see e.g. page 18, line 27).

In view of the substantial differences between Yannas and the instant claims, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **50-3732**, Order No. **13323.105005**. Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account No. **50-3732** and Order No. **13323.105005**.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING, L.L.P.

Dated: February 18, 2009 By: /michael willis/
Jonathan D. Ball / Michael A. Willis
Reg. No. 59,928 / Reg. No. 53,913

KING & SPALDING, L.L.P.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-4003
(212) 556-2115 (212) 556-2222 (Fax)